

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,190	12/31/2003	Toshiyuki Ogata	Q77760	5536
75	590 12/04/2006	EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			ZIMMER, MARC S	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4	
-	

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/748,190	OGATA ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Marc S. Zimmer	1712		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is a soint of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Oc	ctober 2006.			
· —		action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 and 8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 and 8 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	on Papers				
9)□ .	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•			
10) 🗌 :	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	xaminer.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment	• •				
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Infom	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te		

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. A recitation that indicates the relative quantities of two types of structural unit critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). At issue is Applicant's characterization of the stated ratio as a "molar weight" ratio. The Examiner is unfamiliar with a "molar weight" ratio and, in fact, the Specification does not appear to support such a ratio at page 10, which Applicant alluded to as providing a supporting disclosure. Rather, there is only mentioned a molar ratio. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al., U.S. patent # 6,340,734 alone or in view of Tokutake et al., JP 4-130324.

As the Examiner had mentioned earlier, the polymer containing hydroxybenzylsilsesquioxane units and phenylsilsesquioxane units mentioned by Lin et

Art Unit: 1712

al. is actually an alternative to the genus of polymer materials that represent the primary focus of their invention. It is acknowledged that, when describing these alternatives, there is no express disclosure of the favored ratio of units bearing alkali-soluble groups to units bearing alkali-insoluble groups. It is the Examiner's position, however, that the skilled artisan will appreciate that this ratio would preferably much the same as it is in the copolymers that represent the preferred embodiments of that invention, i.e. where the contribution of units alkali-soluble groups as a fraction of the total is 0.4 to 1 (corresponding to a molar ratio of 4:6 to 1:0 which overlaps substantially with the ratio being recited).

If Applicant is dubious as to the validity of the Examiner's rationale, they should consider that, had Lin been completely silent as to a preferred molar ratio of these units, the skilled artisan would have been forced to consult the related prior art to see what ratio of these units had been advocated in those disclosures. In this connection, Tokutake states that a mole ratio of units bearing alkali-soluble groups to units bearing alkali-insoluble groups should be 5:5 to 7:3 which overlaps completely with the range now present in claims 1 and 8. It is said that the effects of the invention, i.e. a positive resist having high resistance to oxygen plasma and excellent pattern cross section attributes is not realized if the ratio of these units is outside that taught on the first page of the document.

As an aside, Applicant shows no criticality for this parameter whatsoever.

In view of these points, the new limitations are at least prima facie obvious.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,190

Art Unit: 1712

Page 4

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,190 Page 5

Art Unit: 1712

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 27, 2006

MARC S. ZIMMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

man James